SUBJECT No. 48.

Preservation of documents produced in civil cases.

Messrs. U. Shiva Rao and S. Manjiah, Chikmagalur Municipality.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 49.

Records of Munsiffs' Courts.

Messrs. Chikramanna, Byregowda, and Dodda Vembralliah, Kolar taluk.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 50.

Time for return of documents filed in civil courts.

Mr. G. Srinivasa Murti, Hassan taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Documents filed in the Munsiffs' Courts are required to be taken back within one month from the date of application, as otherwise the application will be rejected and a fresh one has to be presented thus resulting in loss to the parties. The period may therefore be extended to two months.

Reply of Government.—This has been done. (*Vide* corrigendum, dated 19th May 1910, to Civil Rule of Practice No. 117, dated the 19th September 1904.)

SUBJECT No. 51.

Return of certified copies of decrees and judgments.

Messrs. C. Subba Rao, S. R. Balakrishna Rao and S. Sitaramiah, Shimoga Municipality; and V. Raghavachar, Mysore taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The proceedings of the Chief Court No. 5—1, dated 30th June 1910, prevent the return of copies of decrees and judgments of the lower courts produced with the memoranda of appeals. This necessitates obtaining fresh copies for second appeals. The rule may be changed so as to allow of return of copies on application.

The Chief Judge pointed out that, in second appeals, the production of the judgment of the original court was not insisted upon. Messrs C. Subba Rao and V. Raghavachar argued as to why there should be any objection to the return of the copies as before. They are certified copies and if the parties want them again they will have to incur additional expenditure.

Reply of Government.—The Chief Court will be consulted.

SUBJECT No. 52.

Reduction of half the court fee in cases decided *ex parte*.

Messrs. C. Vaman Rao and Nadig Subba Rao, Nagar taluk.

Summary of discussion.—When parties in dispute in civil suits come to an understanding and settle their disputes of their own accord, half the court fee is remitted. The same concession may be shown when the cases are decided *ex parte* in the absence of the defendant. If the defendant agrees beforehand to have the case decided without his presence, he may be required to present half the cost at once and have the matter decided.

Reply of Government.—The matter was carefully considered and the suggestion was found impracticable to adopt.

SUBJECT No. 53.

Levy of *ad valorem* fee.

Mr. N. V. Narasimha Iyengar, Law Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—One-half of *ad valorem* fee to be levied on plaints to begin with and the other half recovered when contention commences.